

### REMARKS

Claim 17-35 are pending. In the Office Action mailed March 28, 2008, the Examiner rejected claims 17-35 as being anticipated by Rune et al. US PG Pub 2001/0029166 ("Rune"). Claims 17, 27 and 32 are independent claims.

The Applicant has amended independent claims 17 and 27 to more clearly express the Applicant's invention in terms of a multiphase protocol for determining a central coordinator node for a communication network, wherein discrete listening, discovery, election and confirm phases, each involving specialized tasks, are performed sequentially, and wherein the discovery and election phases are conducted for a predetermined duration immediately after the preceding phase. The amendments have support in the original specification at, for example, p. 17 lines 13-15, p. 17 line 20 to p.18 line 2 and p. 18 lines 8-11. The approach recited in the amended claims facilitates an arbitrary number of nodes that are participating in protocol by which a central coordinator node is selected in conducting and completing the discovery and election phases of the protocol at approximately the same time, that is, nearly simultaneously. Substantially contemporaneous discovery and election by all participating nodes results in the nodes developing a common understanding of the network topology and promotes consensus among the nodes about which node is the optimal choice to serve as the central coordinator.

Rune does not disclose, teach or suggest what is recited in amended claims 17 and 27. In the Office Action, the Examiner asserted that Rune's disclosure of transmission by Bluetooth (BT) units of PAGE RESPONSE messages having Device Access Codes (DAC) and Bluetooth unit Addresses (BR\_ADDR) corresponds to the discovery phase recited in these claims before amendment; that use of information in the PAGE RESPONSE messages to determine which nodes to connect to corresponds to the

election phase in these claims before amendment; and that connecting to these nodes and indicating a master/slave preference corresponds to the confirm phase recited in these claims before amendment. Even if one accepts such correspondence, however, there is no indication in Rune to conduct a discovery phase of predetermined duration immediately after a listening phase and, and then to conduct an election phase of predetermined duration immediately after the discovery phase, both of which are recited in these claims after amendment. For example, FIG. 7 of Rune shows that transitions between the asserted discovery, election and confirm phases are triggered by the receipt of certain message types, rather than predetermined phase timeouts. That is, phase transitions in Rune appear to be message-dependent rather than time-dependent.

Moreover, the third independent claim, claim 32, recites listening, discovery and election phase timers that enforce phase time limits and phase transitions and offer similar advantages to those discussed above in relation to claims 17 and 27.

Rune does not disclose, teach or suggest what is recited in claim 32. Rune does not disclose listening, discovery and election phase timers that enforce phase time limits and phase transitions. In the Office Action, the Examiner asserted correspondence for listening, discovery and election phase timers at ¶17 of Rune (see e.g. the rejections of claims, 20, 30 and 32). However, the Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner is mistaken in this respect and requests his reconsideration. Paragraph 7 of Rune discusses assignment to master and slave BT units of transmission time slots defined in the Bluetooth specification after a master/slave relationship has been established. Assignment of transmission time slots to master and slave BT units does not fairly teach or suggest listening, discovery and election phase timers that enforce phase time limits and transitions in a multiphase method for determining a central coordinator node.


Since the independent claims are allowable, the dependent claims are allowable.

Appl. No. 10/775,967  
RCE and Amendment Dated July 3, 2008  
Reply to Office Action mailed March 28, 2008

In view of the foregoing, consideration and favorable action on all claims are respectfully requested. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Should any question remain in view of this communication, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned so that a prompt disposition of this application can be achieved.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Scot A. Reader', with a stylized, flowing script.

Scot A. Reader  
Reg. Number 39,002  
Tel. No. (303) 440-4050  
Scot A. Reader, P.C.  
1320 Pearl Street, Suite 228  
Boulder, CO 80302